

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,961	12/13/2001	Susan Marie Cox	ROC920010225US1	1968
75	90 04/21/2005		EXAM	INER
Valerie G. Dugan			PAYNE, DAVID C	
Dugan & Dugar	n, L.L.P.			
18 John Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Tarrytown, NY 10591			2633	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/021,961	COX ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David C. Payne	2633
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet t	with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period volume to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of the will expire SIX (6) MC, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 D 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final.	
Disposition of Claims		,
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 December 2001</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)l drawing(s) be held in abey ion is required if the drawir	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	 □	0.000
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	r Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date i Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

 Claim(s) 1-6, 12-15, 17-21, 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Delvaux US 6,775,305 B1 (Delvaux).

Re claim(s) 1, 12, 17, 23

Delvaux disclosed

A multi-channel communication link system that adds a sequence number to each proposed data packet targeted for transport across the communication link. Transport protocol data unit comprising a data packet and a corresponding sequence number that defines (marks) the relative position of the individual data packet in a source data packet stream as it traverses an interface between an ATM layer device and a physical layer device with a set of predetermined transport links (col./lines: 7/54-65). The streams of data packets are disassembled and reassembled based on the sequence numbers. The multi-channel link includes a plurality of communication line transmitters (143 of Figure 8) a plurality of communication lines (146 of Figure 8), a plurality of communication line receivers (145 of Figure 8). The invention also includes the ability for bandwidth on demand flexibility by adding additional communication lines to the physical transport link (col./lines: 18/10-25).

Re claims 2-6, 13-15, 18-21, 24-26

Delvaux disclosed using sequence number or markers in the individual streams to identify the data

Art Unit: 2633

units for reassembly (col./lines: 7/54-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claim(s) 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delvaux US 6,775,305 B1 (Delvaux) in view of Widmer US 5,648,776 (Widmer).
 - Re claims 7 and 8, Delvaux disclosed the aforementioned invention but does not disclose where comma-sync characters are used.
 - Widmer disclosed the use of comma-sync characters in a serial bit detection system, see col./lines: 6/55-65. It would have been obvious to use the comma-sync characters in the Delvaux system for synchronization as this is a IEEE standard and used because it is not a widely used character.
- 5. Claim(s) 10, 11, 16, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delvaux US 6,775,305 B1 (Delvaux) in view of Morikura et al. US 5,539,846 (Morikura).

Re claim(s) 10, 16, 22, 27

Delvaux disclosed

the multi-channel communication link system as previously shown but does not disclose using optical fibers. Morikura disclosed using optical fibers for transmitting signals that have undergone a parallel-serial conversion (see Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use optical fibers as the transmission medium of the Delvaux invention since optical fibers are superior to other transmission media in flexibility, lightness in weight, and signal

Art Unit: 2633

transmission stability to temperature as discussed in Morikura, see col./lines: 2/5-15.

Re claim(s) 11

Delvaux disclosed

the multi-channel communication link system as previously shown but does not disclose using 8b/10b encoding. Morikura disclosed using 8b/10b encoding, see col./lines: 2/55-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use 8b/10b encoding in the Delvaux invention since adding 2 bits as this code does helps increase synchronization, as discussed in Morikura, see col./lines: 1/25-30.

Claim(s) 9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delvaux US
 6,775,305 B1 (Delvaux) in view of Hutchison et al. US 5,408,473 (Hutchison).

Re claim(s) 9 and 28

Delvaux disclosed

the multi-channel communication link system as previously shown but does not disclose dividing the stream along half-words. Hutchison disclosed a transmitted serial stream that is demultiplexed onto two channels by sending sequential blocks of equal number of bits over alternate channels (see Figure 2, col./lines: 2/48-52). These 4 bit transmissions represent half the word unit of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to divide the transmissions in this manner given that a minimum implementation of either invention would require at least two parallel transmissions and therefore evenly divide the transmission data units over the physical links.

 Claim(s) 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delvaux US 6,775,305 B1 (Delvaux) in view of Hutchison et al. US 5,408,473 (Hutchison) and Morikura et al. US 5,539,846 (Morikura).

Art Unit: 2633

Re claim(s) 29

Delvaux disclosed

the multi-channel communication link system as previously shown but does not disclose dividing the stream along half-words and optical fibers. Hutchison disclosed a transmitted serial stream that is demultiplexed onto two channels by sending sequential blocks of equal number of bits over alternate channels (see Figure 2, col./lines: 2/48-52). These 4 bit transmissions represent half the word unit of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to divide the transmissions in this manner given that a minimum implementation of either invention would require at least two parallel transmissions and therefore evenly divide the transmission data units over the physical links.

Morikura disclosed using optical fibers for transmitting signals that have undergone a parallel-serial conversion (see Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use optical fibers as the transmission medium of the Delvaux invention since optical fibers are superior to other transmission media in flexibility, lightness in weight, and signal transmission stability to temperature as discussed in Morikura, see col./lines: 2/5-15.

Conclusion

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (571) 272-3024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2633

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dcp

David C. Payne Patent Examiner

AU 2633